

REMARKS

Claims 1-38, 40-49 and 51-75 are pending in the present application. Claims 39 and 50 were previously canceled. Claims 1-37 were previously withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

I. CLAIM REJECTION - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 38, 40-47, 56, 57, 59, 61, 63-66, 69, 72 and 74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as assertedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2005/0164502 to Deng (hereinafter “*Deng*”).

The Examiner’s cited reference, *Deng*, was filed on January 22, 2004. The present application claims priority to a provisional patent application, serial number 60/498,194, filed on August 25, 2003 (‘194 provisional application). The present application, at paragraph [0001] claims priority to the ‘194 provisional application and incorporates its disclosure by reference. Each of claims 38, 40-47, 56, 57, 59, 61, 63-66, 69, 72 and 74 finds full and direct support in the disclosure of the ‘194 provisional application. As such, *Deng*, is **not** prior art to the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw his rejections to claims 38, 40-47, 56, 57, 59, 61, 63-66, 69, 72 and 74.

II. CLAIM REJECTION – 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. *Claims 58, 60, 73 and 75*

Claims 58, 60, 73 and 75 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over *Deng* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0037269 to Levinson (hereinafter “*Levinson*”).

As noted above, *Deng* is not prior art to the present invention. Therefore, without its teachings, the teachings of *Levinson* alone do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 58, 60, 73, and 75. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw his rejections of claims 58, 60, 73, and 75.

B. Claim 62

Claim 62 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over *Deng* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0154188 to Hirayama (hereinafter “*Hirayama*”).

As noted above, *Deng* is not prior art to the present invention. Therefore, without its teachings, the teachings of *Hirayama* alone do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 62. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw his rejection of claim 62.

C. Claims 52-55, 70 and 71

Claims 52-55, 70 and 71 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over *Deng* and *French* as applied to claims 38, 40-49, 56, 57, 59, 61, 63-68, 72 and 74 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0186513 to Letz (hereinafter “*Letz*”).

As noted above, *Deng* is not prior art to the present invention. Therefore, without its teachings, the combined teachings of *French* and *Letz* do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 52-55, 70, and 71. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw his rejections of claims 52-55, 70, and 71.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Thomas J. Meaney, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

12/11/07
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Thomas J. Meaney/
Thomas J. Meaney
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 41,990